

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/005,390	ZAPPALA, STEPHEN M.
	Examiner George R. Evanisko	Art Unit 3762

All Participants: _____ **Status of Application:** _____

(1) George R. Evanisko. (3) _____.

(2) Jenifer Haeckl. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 August 2005 **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103 rejections of claims 12 and 13

Claims discussed:

12, 13

Prior art documents discussed:

Krakovsky

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Although Krakovsky may not show the lead being adapted to be implanted at the suprapubic level of the neurovascular bundle of the phallus, Krakovsky still is capable of meeting the functional use recitations of being implanted at that location since it is an implantable lead and nothing would prevent someone from implanting it in that location. Therefore, claims 12 and 13 were canceled.